



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Kathleen Clarke
Executive Director

Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210

PO Box 145801

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

801-538-5340

801-359-3940 (Fax)

801-538-7223 (TDD)

June 12, 2001

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DRH*

FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Specialist II *GA*

RE: 2001 First Quarter Water Monitoring, Nevada Electric Investment Co.,
Wellington Prep Plant, [REDACTED]

1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [x] NO []

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.

Renewal of the permit is December 10, 2004. The MRP commits to sampling baseline water parameters one year prior to the renewal date.

Resampling due date 12/10/04

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [] NO [x]

At Well GW-13, only field parameters were collected. GW-13 has very slow recovery. When initially pumped, the well produces less than a liter of water; barely enough to collect field parameters. When allowing a day to recover, the well still does not produce any measurable water. GW-13 is located in a non-essential water monitoring area since the surface facilities no longer exist in the area. It is recommended that the site be removed from the Water Monitoring Plan.

At site GW-3, the Field Specific Conductivity was recorded as >9999. This is due to the field technician not having a meter able to read values greater than 9999 umohms. The permittee has once again been notified that this is unacceptable.

4. Were irregularities found in the data?

YES [] NO [x]

A total of four samples analysis had ion balance differences greater than 5 percent, ranging from 6.72 percent to 9.16 percent. Field Specific Conductivities for samples collected on the West side of the property were originally input at approximately 10 percent of their true/anticipated values. It was determined the lab input a comma in values greater than 1,000 umohms, which corrupted the electronic file and eventually eliminated the digits greater than 999. The problem was identified and resolved.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [x] NO []
2nd month, YES [x] NO []
3rd month, YES [x] NO []

Sites 003 through 008 had documentation for a site visits every month.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES [x] NO []

All sites were dry so no parameters were submitted

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES [] NO [x]

All sites were dry so no parameters were submitted

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

No further action is necessary for the 2001 First Quarter Water Monitoring data. Deficiencies noted earlier have been addressed adequately.